

MAY 23 2008

Attorney Docket: 00336  
U.S. Application No. 09/893,910 Examiner Nguyen Art Unit 2614  
Response to February 29, 2008 Office Action

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated February 29, 2008, the Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and on the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 7, 11-15, 19, 21-23, 26, and 28 are pending in this application. Claims 4-6, 8-10, 16-18, 20, 24-25, 27, and 29-36 are, or previously were, canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

#### Telephone Interview

Examiner Nguyen is thanked for the telephone interview of May 5, 2008. Examiner Nguyen and Scott Zimmerman discussed the independent claims and particularly the features "*associating a calling party's telephone number with a group*" and "*associating the group to a network address of the source computer.*" Examiner Nguyen said the amended claims "looked good," but she must perform another search.

#### Rejection under § 103 (a) over *Roberts*

Claims 1, 6-7, 11-14, 19, 21, 24-26, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 6,295,551 to Roberts, *et al.*

Claims 6 and 24-25 have been canceled, so the rejection of these claims is moot.

Claims 1, 7, 11-14, 19, 21, 26, and 28 are not obvious over *Roberts*. These claims recite, or incorporate, features that are not taught or suggested by *Roberts*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites "*associating a calling party's telephone number with a group*" and "*associating the group to a network address of the source computer.*" Support for such features may be found at least at paragraph [0069] of the as-filed application. Independent claim 1 also recites "*receiving a dual-tone multi-frequency input after the voice session is established*" and, in

response to the dual-tone multi-frequency input, *"retrieving the network address from the memory that is associated with the calling party's telephone number."* Support for such features may be found at least at paragraph [0048] of the as-filed application. Independent claim 1 is reproduced below, and independent claims 11 and 21 recite similar features.

[c01] A system for viewing contents of a source computer via a computer network, the system comprising:

- means for associating a calling party's telephone number with a group;
- means for associating the group to a network address of the source computer;
- means for storing a result of the associating;
- means for establishing a voice session between the calling party and a called party;
- means for receiving a dual-tone multi-frequency input after the voice session is established;
- in response to the dual-tone multi-frequency input,
  - means for retrieving the network address from the memory that is associated with the calling party's telephone number,
  - means for establishing a first data session between the calling party's device and the source computer, and
  - means for establishing a second data session between a called party's device and the source computer;
- means for terminating the voice session; and
- means for maintaining the first data session and the second data session despite termination of the voice session.

*Roberts* does not obviate all these features. *Roberts* describes two computers that display a shared view of their user interfaces. See U.S. Patent 6,295,551 to *Roberts, et al.* at column 3, lines 50-65. Changes to the user interface are transmitted to a server, and the server communicates the changes to the other user interface. See *id.* at column 4, lines 5-15. "If audio communication is established first," such as a call session, the computers may be linked through the server. *Id.* at column 6, lines 1-10. Still, though, *Roberts* fails to teach or suggest "associating a calling party's telephone number with a group" and "associating the group to a

Attorney Docket: 00336  
U.S. Application No. 09/893,910 Examiner Nguyen Art Unit 2614  
Response to February 29, 2008 Office Action

*network address of the source computer.*" The patent to Roberts, *et al.* also fails to teach or suggest "receiving a dual-tone multi-frequency input after the voice session is established" and, in response to the dual-tone multi-frequency input, "retrieving the network address from the memory that is associated with the calling party's telephone number." The patent to Roberts, *et al.*, then, cannot obviate independent claims 1, 11, and 21.

Claims 1, 7, 11-14, 19, 21, 26, and 28, then, are not obvious over *Roberts*. Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 all similarly recite features that are not taught or suggested by *Roberts*. Their respective dependent claims incorporate these same features. Claims 1, 7, 11-14, 19, 21, 26, and 28, then, cannot be obvious over *Roberts*, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

**Rejection under § 103 (a) over Roberts & Lund**

Claims 2-3, 15-16, and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Roberts* in view of U.S. Patent 5,978,806 to Lund. Claim 16 has been canceled, though, so the rejection of this claim is moot.

Claims 2-3, 15, and 22-23 are not obvious over *Roberts* and *Lund*. These claims depend, respectively, from independent claims 1, 11, and 21. As the above paragraphs explained, *Roberts* fails to teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, and *Lund* does not cure these deficiencies. *Lund* uses a called number to retrieve a called party's home page. See U.S. Patent 5,978,806 to Lund at column 3, lines 15-25. The combined teaching of *Roberts* and *Lund*, however, still fails to teach or suggest "associating a calling party's telephone number with a group" and "associating the group to a network address of the source computer." The combined teaching of *Roberts* and *Lund* also fails to teach or suggest "receiving a dual-tone multi-frequency input after the voice session is established" and, in response to the dual-tone multi-frequency input, "retrieving the network address from the memory that is associated with the calling party's telephone number." The combined teaching of *Roberts* and *Lund*, then,

MAY 23 2008

Attorney Docket: 00336

U.S. Application No. 09/893,910 Examiner Nguyen Art Unit 2614

Response to February 29, 2008 Office Action

cannot obviate independent claims 1, 11, and 21, from one of which claims 2-3, 15, and 22-23 depend. The Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

**Rejection under § 103 (a) over *Roberts & Greenberg***

Claims 4-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Roberts* in view of U.S. Patent 5,978,806 to Lund. These claims, however, have been canceled, so the rejection of these claims is moot.

---

If any issues remain outstanding, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or [scott@scottzimmerman.com](mailto:scott@scottzimmerman.com).

Respectfully submitted,



Scott P. Zimmerman  
Attorney for the Assignee  
Reg. No. 41,390